

Michael J. Domino, President  
John M. Bredemeyer III, Vice-President  
Glenn Goldsmith  
A. Nicholas Krupski  
Greg Williams



Town Hall Annex  
54375 Route 25  
P.O. Box 1179  
Southold, New York 11971  
Telephone (631) 765-1892  
Fax (631) 765-6641

**BOARD OF TOWN TRUSTEES**  
**TOWN OF SOUTHOLD**

**Minutes**

**Wednesday, May 16, 2018**

**5:30 PM**

**Present Were:** Michael J. Domino, President  
John M. Bredemeyer, Vice-President  
Glenn Goldsmith, Trustee  
A. Nicholas Krupski, Trustee  
Greg Williams, Trustee  
Elizabeth Cantrell, Senior Clerk Typist  
Damon Hagan, Assistant Town Attorney

**CALL MEETING TO ORDER**  
**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**NEXT FIELD INSPECTION:** Wednesday, June 13, 2018 at 8:00 AM

**NEXT TRUSTEE MEETING:** Wednesday, June 20, 2018, at 5:30 PM at the Main Meeting Hall.

**WORKSESSIONS:** Monday, June 18, 2018, at 4:30 PM at the Town Hall Annex 2nd floor Board Room, and on Wednesday, June 20, 2018, at 5:00 PM at the Main Meeting Hall.

**APPROVE MINUTES:** Approve Minutes of April 5, 2018, and April 18, 2018

**TRUSTEE DOMINO:** Good evening and welcome to our regularly scheduled May 16th, 2018, monthly meeting. At this time I would call the meeting to order and ask you to stand for the pledge.

(Pledge of Allegiance)

As is our custom, I would like to recognize the people the dais. To my left is Trustee Bredemeyer, Trustee Goldsmith, Trustee Krupski and Trustee Williams. To my right is Assistant Town Attorney Damon Hagan and Senior Clerk Typist Elizabeth Cantrell. We also have with us tonight our court stenographer Wayne Galante, and the Conservation Advisory Council member John Stein.

Agendas are located on the podiums if you would like, and also outside in the lobby.

At this time I would like to announce the postponements. On page nine, we have number two, Milone & MacBroom, Inc., on behalf of **CROSS SOUND FERRY SERVICES, INC., c/o RICHARD MACMURRAY** requests a Wetland Permit and a

Coastal Erosion Permit to revitalize key components of the ferry service's terminal at Orient Point consisting of along the existing  $\pm$  270 foot long bulkhead install  $\pm$  270' of new bulkhead along the shoreline in front of the existing degrading bulkhead that is currently used for ship docking which will permanently fill  $\pm$ 600sq.ft. of water area; temporarily install docking dolphins to accommodate continued operations; remove existing vehicle access ramps and stanchions which will be rehabilitated and replaced; and any related support structures to be replaced.

Located: 41270 Main Road, Orient. SCTM# 1000-15-9-16.

And number three, **SCOTT KAUFMAN** requests a Wetland Permit and a Coastal Erosion Permit to remove existing damaged stairway and terrace retaining walls; construct along eroding toe of bluff approximately 210 linear feet of stone revetment, including angled westerly return, all consisting of approximately 3 to 5 ton stone placed over 50 to 100 pound core stone and filter cloth; restore bluff face using terrace retaining walls, approximately 600 cubic yards of sand re-nourishment (including approximately 350 cubic yards to cover proposed revetment), and native plantings; construct a  $\pm$ 3' wide berm with  $\pm$ 50 cubic yards of sand/loam within 15' wide vegetated non-turf buffer to be established adjacent to bluff crest to control storm-water runoff; and construct a new 4'x $\pm$ 50' elevated bluff stairway with landings and handrails consisting of 4' wide x  $\pm$ 3' long entry steps at top of bluff down to a 4'x8' upper platform with bench to 4' x  $\pm$ 8' steps to a 4'x8' middle landing with bench to 4' x  $\pm$ 10' steps to a 4'x4' middle landing to 4' x  $\pm$ 8' steps to a 4'x6.7' lower landing to 4' x  $\pm$ 14' stairs to beach.

Located: 2050 Dignans Road, Cutchogue. SCTM# 1000-83-2-7.3

On page ten, we have number one, JMO Environmental Consulting on behalf of **CHARLES & BRENDA GRIMES** requests a Wetland Permit to construct a 15'x24' bluestone patio on sand; stepping stone paths; 4'x6' steps; a 4'x158" fixed dock utilizing "Thru-Flow" decking; a 3'x12' ramp; and a 6'x20' float secured by two (2) piles.

Located: 4145 Wells Road, Peconic. SCTM# 1000-86-2-12.6

On pages 13 and 14, we have Jeffrey Patanjo on behalf of **KAREN & CAREY FLAHERTY** requests a Wetland Permit to remove existing fixed dock and steps to beach, and replace with a proposed 4'x68' fixed dock supported with 10" diameter CCA piles; install a seasonal 30"x16' aluminum ramp; install a 6'x20' seasonal floating dock with un-treated timber decking situated in an "I" configuration and supported by two (2) 10" diameter CCA piles.

Located: 1077 Bay Home Road, Southold. SCTM# 1000-56-5-39

Stacey Bishop on behalf of **FORDHAM HOUSE LLC, c/o DENIS BOUBOULIS** requests a Wetland Permit to install a  $\pm$ 1,167sq.ft. on-grade paver patio along the seaward side of the dwelling; extend existing westerly 15' long by 10' high by 12" thick concrete and stone veneer retaining wall an additional 35' seaward for a total length of 50' beginning at the left rear corner of existing dwelling; at seaward end of westerly retaining wall, install a 28' long, varying height concrete and stone veneer retaining wall parallel with the dwelling; along easterly side of property, extend existing 3' high natural stone retaining wall an additional  $\pm$ 45' seaward; approximately 15'

seaward of proposed 28' long parallel retaining wall, install a  $\pm 3'$  high by  $\pm 45'$  long retaining wall situated approximately 1' landward of established 50' wide non-disturbance buffer; and to install a generator pad, generator, and buried gas tank for the generator. Located: 5205 The Long Way, East Marion. SCTM# 1000-21-5-11

AMP Architecture on behalf of **WILLIAM GRELLA & GARY OSBORNE** request a Wetland Permit for the as-built 232sq.ft. Belgium block parking area; as-built 121sq.ft. Belgium block walkway; as-built 517.3sq.ft. managed lawn areas; as-built 240sq.ft. gardens; as-built 160.5sq.ft. crushed shell areas; as-built 22.3sq.ft. metal planter box; as-built 14.3sq.ft. metal waterfall; as-built 15sq.ft. rear concrete stairs; as-built 713sq.ft. pavers on sand; as-built 95sq.ft. gravel on sand; as-built 11sq.ft. fire pit on sand; as-built 41sq.ft. open shower with Belgium block on sand base; as-built two (2) 7.2sq.ft. concrete table bases; as-built 16sq.ft. front concrete stairs; and for the proposed installation of a 46.4sq.ft. set of second-story wood stairs consisting of a 4'x4.3' upper platform with 4'x7.4' stairs to seaward side patio area; proposed installation of 27sq.ft. of pavers on sand.

Located: 1200 First Street, New Suffolk. SCTM# 1000-117-7-30

Those have all been postponed.

I would also like to announce at this time under Town Code 275-8(c), the files were officially closed seven days ago. Submission of paperwork after that date may result in a delay of the processing of the application.

At this time I'll entertain a motion to have our next field inspection, Wednesday, June 13th, 8:00 AM at the Town Annex.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: So moved.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Motion made and seconded. All in favor? (ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE DOMINO: I'll entertain a motion to hold the next Trustee meeting Wednesday, June 20th, 2018, at 5:30, at the main meeting hall.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor? (ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Motion to hold the next work session at the Town annex board room, second floor, on June 18th, 2018, at 4:30 PM.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: So moved.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor? (ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Following that, a work session at 5:00 PM, Wednesday, June 20th, at the main meeting hall.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: So moved.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Second.  
TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?  
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE DOMINO: At this time I'll entertain a motion to approve the Minutes of April 5th, 2018 meeting and April 18th, 2018 meeting.  
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: So moved.  
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.  
TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?  
(ALL AYES).

### **I. MONTHLY REPORT:**

The Trustees monthly report for April 2018. A check for \$7,512.08 was forwarded to the Supervisor's Office for the General Fund.

### **II. PUBLIC NOTICES:**

Public Notices are posted on the Town Clerk's Bulletin Board for review.

### **III. STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEWS:**

RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees of the Town of Southold hereby finds that the following applications more fully described in Section VIII Public Hearings Section of the Trustee agenda dated Wednesday, May 16, 2018, are classified as Type II Actions pursuant to SEQRA Rules and Regulations, and are not subject to further review under SEQRA:

Cross Sound Ferry Services, Inc., c/o Richard MacMurray SCTM# 1000-15-9-16  
John & Daniella Venetis SCTM# 1000-87-6-4  
Gardiners Bay Estates Club, c/o Roy Olsen SCTM# 1000-37-4-17  
Timothy Casamento & Kleo King SCTM# 1000-52-9-1.2  
Stuart & Joyce Newman SCTM# 1000-44-1-24  
Domeluca, LLC SCTM# 1000-23-1-2.8  
Treasure Island Cove, LLC SCTM# 1000-23-1-2.9  
Domeluca II, LLC SCTM# 1000-23-1-2.10  
Timothy & Georgia Quinn SCTM# 1000-40-1-14  
George Katsamanis SCTM# 1000-35-4-28.40  
Dimitrios & Irene Antoniadis SCTM# 1000-15-1-4  
George & Debra Coritsidis SCTM# 1000-89-2-3 & 1000-89-2-5.1

TRUSTEE DOMINO: RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees of the Town of Southold hereby finds that the following applications more fully described in Section VIII Public Hearings Section of the Trustee agenda dated Wednesday, May 16, 2018, are classified as Unlisted Actions pursuant to SEQRA Rules and Regulations. A Long Environmental Assessment Form and a field inspection have been completed by the Trustees for the following applications and it is hereby determined that they will not have a significant effect on the environment:

Bradley M. Anderson SCTM# 1000-86-3-1  
David Krupnick SCTM# 1000-115-12-13

MR. HAGAN: Are you moving for the totality of those? You didn't do a motion for the first one.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Yes, in totality. On all.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Move for a motion on the totality of all State Environmental Quality Reviews.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Is there a second?

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

#### **IV. ENVIRONMENTAL DECLARATION OF SIGNIFICANCE PURSUANT TO NEW YORK STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW ACT NYCCR PART 617:**

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Under Roman numeral IV, Jay, if you would.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Yes.

DESCRIPTION OF ACTION: J.M.O Environmental Consulting on behalf of **BRADLEY M. ANDERSON** requests an Amendment to Wetland permit #5649 to install a 3'x16' adjustable ramp and a 6'x20' floating dock secured by (4) piles to be situated in an "L" configuration off of the side of the fixed dock.

Located: 1095 Emerson Road, Southold. SCTM# 1000-86-3-1

#### **S.E.Q.R.A. NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE:**

WHEREAS, on May 14, 2018 the Southold Town Board of Trustees found the application of **BRADLEY M. ANDERSON** to be an Unlisted Action Negative Decision pursuant to SEQRA Rules and Regulations. A Long Environmental Assessment Form and a field inspection have been completed by the Board of Trustees; and it is hereby determined that it will not have a significant effect on the environment, and;

WHEREAS, the Southold Trustees are familiar with this project having visited the site on May 9, 2018 and having considered J.M.O. Environmental Consulting plans for this project dated March 27, 2018 showing the proposed dock and water depths by Sea Level Mapping, and;

WHEREAS, in reviewing the project plans dated March 27, 2018, and water depths it has been determined by the Southold Town Board of Trustees that all potentially significant environmental concerns have been addressed as noted herein:

- Navigation: The proposed dock meets standards and does not extend beyond 1/3 across the water body. Depths for the dock terminus are within Town Trustees, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation and United States Army Corps. Of Engineers guidelines and there is no recognized Federal/New York State/Town navigation channel in the immediate vicinity of the proposed structure.

- Scope: The proposed dock is comparable to docks on neighboring properties in areas where docks historically are used for commercial and recreational purposes.

- Scope in relation to the riparian rights of shell fishers: The plan allows a standard ramp to float design that will not impede access for those seeking shellfish and crustacea in season.

- Scope in relation to view shed: The seasonal end of the proposed dock will not extend appreciably beyond the existing dock and as such the perspective will not be

discernibly different from the existing view.

- Environmental upkeep: The dock design projects a usual lifespan of 30 years with limited pile replacement so as to minimize disturbance of the bottom.

THEREFORE, on account of the foregoing, the Southold Town Board of Trustees approve and authorizes the preparation of a Notice of Negative Declaration pursuant to SEQRA for the aforementioned project. And that's my motion.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Motion made and seconded. All in favor?  
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Next,

DESCRIPTION OF ACTION: En-Consultants on behalf **DAVID KRUPNICK** requests a Wetland Permit to install a 3'x12' hinged ramp and a 6'x20' floating dock situated in a "T" position, parallel to the shoreline and secured by two (2) 8" diameter two-pile dolphins off seaward end of existing 4' x ±46" fixed timber catwalk (with 1.7'x11' bench) to remain; cut existing dilapidated ±17' bulkhead and ±23' groin to grade; and connect water and electricity to the dock.

Located: 880 Deep Hole Drive, Mattituck. SCTM# 1000-115-12-13.

#### S.E.Q.R.A. NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE:

WHEREAS, on May 9, 2018 the Southold Town Board of Trustees found the application of **DAVID KRUPNICK** to be classified as an Unlisted Action Negative Decision pursuant to SEQRA Rules and Regulations. A Long Environmental Assessment Form and a field inspection have been completed by the Board of Trustees, and it is hereby determined that it will not have a significant effect on the environment, and;

WHEREAS, the Southold Trustees are familiar with this project having visited the site on September 12, 2017 and on May 9, 2018, and having considered En-Consultants plans for this project dated April 13, 2018 and survey of John C. Ehlers dated December 11, 2014, and last updated on February 14, 2018 showing the proposed dock and water depths, and;

WHEREAS, in reviewing the project plans dated April 13, 2018 it has been determined by the Southold Town Board of Trustees that all potentially significant environmental concerns have been addressed as noted herein:

- Navigation: The proposed dock meets standards and does not extend beyond 1/3 across the water body. Depths for the dock terminus are within Town Trustees, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation and United States Army Corps. Of Engineers guidelines and there is no recognized Federal/New York State/Town navigation channel in the immediate vicinity of the proposed structure.

- Scope: The proposed dock is comparable to docks on neighboring properties in an area where docks historically are

used for commercial and recreational purposes.

- Scope in relation to the riparian rights of shellfishers: The plan allows a standard ramp to float design that will not impede access for those seeking shellfish and crustacea in season.

- Scope in relation to view shed: The seasonal end of the proposed structure lies within the pier line of neighboring docks and as such the perspective will not be discernibly different.

THEREFORE, on account of the foregoing, the Southold Town Board of Trustees Approve and Authorize the preparation of a Notice of Negative Declaration pursuant to SEQRA for the aforementioned project.

That's my motion.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

## **V. RESOLUTIONS - ADMINISTRATIVE PERMITS:**

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Under Roman numeral V, Administrative Permits.

In order to simplify our meetings, the Board of Trustees regularly groups together actions that are deemed minor or similar in nature. Accordingly I make a motion to approve as a group numbers one through three. They are listed as follows:

Number one, **JOSEPH BATTAGLIA** requests an Administrative Permit to construct a 6' wide covered walk to a 20'x13' (260sq.ft.) ramadas with concrete footings and a slate roof. Located: 2000 Horbart Road, Southold. SCTM# 1000-64-3-3.2

Number two, **PAUL & MARGARET KOBALKA** request an Administrative Permit to install up to a 6 ½' tall by 8' long fence panel along the easterly side of the property line approximately 20' landward from the top of the bluff connecting to existing fencing; and to plant native Red Cedar trees along existing fencing for additional screening. Located: 695 Petty's Drive, Orient. SCTM# 1000-14-2-23

And number three, **CHARLES & BRENDA GRIMES** request an Administrative Permit to remove dead trees, dead branches and debris from the non-turf buffer and wetlands; dead trees are painted with a red X or Red marking; remove invasive species in non-turf buffer, oriental bittersweet, English ivy, porcelain berry, Japanese wisteria, winter creeper poison ivy, and kudzu; prune remaining trees and vegetation in non-turf buffer to facilitate new growth; and as further set forth in the project plans provided.

Located: 4145 Wells Road, Peconic. SCTM# 1000-86-2-12.6

And we'll address four, five and six separately.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second the motion.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Number four, Jerry Cibulski on behalf of **GUNTHER & CAROLE GEISS** request an Administrative Permit for the existing 35" wide by 16.9' long wood embankment stairs to the water. Located: 2155 Long Creek Drive, Southold. SCTM# 1000-55-7-7

The Trustees did a field inspection on May 9th and noted that the project was straightforward.

The LWRP coordinator found this to be inconsistent. The inconsistency arises from the fact that the structure was built without obtaining a Trustee permit.

I would note that by approving this, the Trustees will address the inconsistency. Accordingly, I make a motion to approve this application.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Number five, Valerie Marvin, Esq., on behalf of **LOUIS PAGNUTTI** requests an Administrative Permit to demolish existing dwelling and foundation and fill in area to grade; move fill from new foundation located upland to fill area of demised foundation with any excess to be removed from property; to conduct construction activity within 100' from landward edge of wetlands for the construction of a single-family, two-story dwelling with deck on seaward side; abandon existing and install a new sanitary system landward of Trustee jurisdiction; install gutters to leaders to drywells on the new dwelling; and to install a new gravel driveway.

Located: 57475 Route 48, Greenport. SCTM# 1000-44-2-5

This project has been removed from the group of approvals because it was deemed to be inconsistent by the LWRP coordinator.

The Trustees performed a field inspection on May 9th, and based on that inspection we requested a set of stamped, signed plans, which have been entered into the file, and that a minimum of ten-foot, excuse me, I guess we discussed 15-foot at work session. A minimum of 15-foot non-turf buffer be maintained.

The inconsistency draws from the fact of not having complied with the requirements for having a permit for activities on the property.

Therefore, by granting a permit for this project it will be brought into consistency, and based on our inspection and field inspection and work session, I would move to approve this application with the maintenance of a minimum of a 15-foot non-turf buffer adjacent to the bluff face and whereby granting a permit will bring it into consistency. That's my motion.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: The next application, number six, En-Consultants on behalf of **NITIN P. DESAI & C. BARSİ, LLC** request an Administrative Permit to demolish and remove existing



one-story, single-family dwelling, 1-story frame building and shed, gazebo, concrete surface, and sanitary system; construct a new two-story, single-family dwelling located  $\pm 100'$  from bluff crest; install a drainage system of leaders to gutters to drywells to collect roof runoff; and install a septic system, detached garage, and driveway to be located outside Trustee jurisdiction. Located: 18915 Soundview Avenue, Southold. SCTM# 1000-51-1-15

With respect to this particular application, the Board in performing their field inspection on May 9th, noted that there was a large amount of privet hedge that was on the bluff side, and the Board felt that to avoid damage to the bluff where it might be lodged or blown over, and to maintain it as a soil protective feature, that the Board would allow it to be maintained at a height of three feet. In other words not less than three feet.

So based on our field inspection, and the fact that the application has been deemed consistent with the LWRP, I would approve with the stipulation that the privet will be allowed to be cut no shorter than three feet.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Motion made and seconded. All in favor?  
(ALL AYES).

#### **VI. APPLICATIONS FOR EXTENSIONS/TRANSFERS/ADMINISTRATIVE AMENDMENTS:**

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Under Roman numeral VI, again, in order to simplify our meeting I make a motion to approve as a group items one, two, four through 12 and 14 through 18. They are listed as follows:

Number one, Patricia Moore, Esq. on behalf of **ALAN & SHARON EIDLER** request a One-Year Extension to Wetland Permit #8836, as issued on June 22, 2016, and Amended on December 13, 2017.

Located: 1052 Canoe Path, Mattituck. SCTM# 1000-106-12-3.1

Number two, Docko, Inc., on behalf of **FISHERS ISLAND DEV. CORP., c/o FISHERS ISLAND MARINA, LLC** requests a One-Year Extension to Wetland Permit #8798 and Coastal Erosion Permit #8798C, as issued on May 18, 2016, and Amended on March 22, 2017.

Located: Central Avenue, Fishers Island. SCTM# 1000-10-1-9

Number Four, Creative Environmental Design on behalf of **EDWARD L. DALEY** requests a Transfer of Wetland Permit #8115 from Andrea & Steven Kolyer to Edward L. Daley, as issued on March 20, 2013.

Located: 1350 Paradise Point Road, Southold. SCTM# 1000-81-3-23

Number five, Patricia Moore, Esq. on behalf of **CLIFFSIDE RESORT CONDOMINIUM** requests a Transfer of Wetland Permit #5429 from Breezy Sound to Cliffside Resort Condominium, as issued on October 26, 2001.

Located: 61475 County Road 48, Greenport. SCTM# 1000-45-1-2.2  
(Formerly 1000-45-1-2.1)

Number six, Patricia Moore, Esq. on behalf of **CLIFFSIDE RESORT CONDOMINIUM** requests a Transfer of Wetland Permit #5866 from Breezy Sound Corp. To Cliffside Resort Condominium, as issued on February 25, 2004.

Located: 61475 County Road 48, Greenport. SCTM# 1000-45-1-2.2

(Formerly 1000-45-1-2.1)

Number seven, **DENIS & NANCY COLE** request a Transfer of Wetland Permit #7155 from James Maino to Denis & Nancy Cole, as issued on August 19, 2009 and Amended on July 23, 2014.

Located: 655 Albacore Drive, Southold. SCTM# 1000-57-1-17

Number eight, **J & WENDY MOCCO** request a Transfer of Wetland Permit #8944 from Vishnudat Seodat to J & Wendy Mocco, as issued on January 18, 2017.

Located: 580 Lloyds Lane, Mattituck. SCTM# 1000-99-3-4.2

Number nine, Patricia Moore, Esq. on behalf of **LAWRENCE KAPLAN & DENISE BLESİ-KAPLAN** requests a Transfer of Wetland Permit #6792 from John & Valerie Kramer to Lawrence Kaplan & Denise Blesi-Kaplan, as issued on January 23, 2008.

Located: 2225 Calves Neck Road, Southold. SCTM# 1000-70-4-45.3

Number ten, Patricia Moore, Esq. on behalf of **LAWRENCE KAPLAN & DENISE BLESİ-KAPLAN** requests a Transfer of Wetland Permit #2022 from Myrtle K. Hendrickson to Lawrence Kaplan & Denise Blesi-Kaplan, as issued on August 2, 1985, and Amended on February 28, 1988, and Amended again on November 17, 1988.

Located: 2225 Calves Neck Road, Southold. SCTM# 1000-70-4-45.3

Number eleven, Patricia Moore, Esq. on behalf of **LAWRENCE KAPLAN & DENISE BLESİ-KAPLAN** requests a Transfer of Wetland Permit #7438 from John & Valerie Kramer to Lawrence Kaplan & Denise Blesi-Kaplan, as issued on November 17, 2010.

Located: 2225 Calves Neck Road, Southold. SCTM# 1000-70-4-45.3

Number 12, **STEIN SEA FARMS, LLC** requests a Transfer of Wetland Permit #7568 from New Suffolk Fishing Station, Inc. To Stein Sea Farms, LLC, as issued on June 22, 2011; and for an Administrative Amendment to Wetland Permit #7568 to install 12 davits atop the 10" pilings starting at the seaward-most 80 feet of the 4' wide section of the fixed dock and extending out to the end of the 6' wide section of the dock; the davits will be used to lower and raise oyster cages into the water consisting of wire mesh trays measuring 3'x4'x4' staked on top of one another to a total height of 4' and bound together with chain and/or rope bridles; install 5/8" polyester line parallel to the 6"x6" stringers on the existing fixed dock at the mean high water mark on both sides beginning approximately 50 seaward of the concrete structure and extend out towards Cutchogue Harbor to the end of the dock along both rows of pilings in order to suspend plastic mesh oyster grow-out bags that measure 18"x36"x3" with a float that will allow the grow-out bags to rise and fall with the tides; and to install seagull control and mitigation measures including but not limited to piling caps, bird netting, and stainless steel bird spikes (primarily atop the davits).

Located: 900 First Street, New Suffolk. SCTM# 1000-117-8-17

Number 14, James Jackson on behalf of **1625 INDIAN NECK HOLDING CORP.** requests an Administrative Amendment to Administrative Permit #8231A for the existing 12.2'x12.2' wood deck and 4.3'x4.3' enclosed outdoor shower.

Located: 1625 Indian Neck Lane, Peconic. SCTM# 1000-86-5-8.1

Number 15, Dana Locatell on behalf of **NORTH FORK PROPERTY VENTURES, LLC** requests an Administrative Amendment to Wetland Permit #8990 to lower the proposed catwalk to enable the entire structure to be 2.5' over Mean High Water.

Located: 5310 Skunk Lane, Cutchogue. SCTM# 1000-138-2-15

Number 16, **PREVITE INVESTMENT TRUST** requests an Administrative Amendment to Wetland Permit #9074 to add an approximate 3'x8' wood bench in between two of the pilings at the seaward end of the fixed dock.

Located: 1570 Broadwaters Road, Cutchogue. SCTM# 1000-104-9-7

Number 17, Patricia Moore, Esq. on behalf of **DOUGLAS A. GEROWSKI, MICHELLE GEROWSKI & DOUGLAS J. GEROWSKI** request an Administrative Amendment to Wetland Permit #8922 to reduce the size of the proposed swimming pool from 16'x32' to 14'x28'; relocate stairs off of pool patio and gates for pool fencing.

Located: 2570 Clearview Avenue, Southold. SCTM# 1000-70-10-29.2

And number 18, McCarthy Management, Inc. on behalf of **TIMOTHY CASAMENTO & KLEO KING** requests an Administrative Amendment to Wetland Permit #9164 to approve the survey prepared by Kenneth M. Woychuk Land Surveying, PLLC, last dated April 13, 2018 that depicts an updated wetland line delineation in lieu of the originally approved survey prepared by Kenneth M. Woychuk Land Surveying, PLLC, last dated March 8, 2018.

Located: 2667 Long Creek Drive, Southold. SCTM# 1000-52-9-1.2

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Number three, **STELIOS & PENELOPE NIKOLAKAKOS** request the Last One-Year Extension to Wetland Permit #8622, as issued on June 17, 2015.

Located: 20795 Soundview Avenue, Southold. SCTM# 1000-51-4-13

The Trustees did field inspection on May 9th and met with the owner at the site, and suggested that we modify this permit to include a ten-foot non-turf buffer. That was not in the previous. (Perusing).

All right. So I make a motion we approve this application as submitted.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Number 13, David Dubin, Esq. on behalf of **INDIAN NECK 1, LLC** requests a Transfer of Wetland Permit #1578 from Phil Marco to Indian Neck 1, LLC, as issued on February 8, 1983, and Amended on May 9, 1983; and for an Administrative Amendment to Wetland Permit #1578 for the as-built 14'x14' wood deck on landward side of fixed dock leading to a 4'x12' landward fixed wood ramp to the fixed dock; as-built 3.5'x11' metal ramp to floating dock in lieu of the 4'x8' ramp; additional pilings; and as-built electrical and plumbing connections to deck and dock.

Located: 4170 Indian Neck Lane, Peconic. SCTM# 1000-98-1-27.1

I'm going to make a motion to approve this application with the stipulation that there be no rebuilds of the deck without a permit, and that the applicant show an underwriters certificate for the electrical work.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

## **VII. MOORINGS/STAKE & PULLEY SYSTEMS:**

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Under Roman numeral VII moorings/stake and pulley systems. We'll group these together and include them as a group. They are listed as follows:

Number one, **RUBEN SILVERMAN** requests a Mooring Permit in Corey Creek for a 19' sailboat, replacing Mooring #886.

Access: Public

And number two, **PATRICK MANZO** requests a Mooring Permit in Deep Hole Creek for a 21' outboard motorboat, replacing Mooring #623. Access: Private

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

## **VIII. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Under Roman numeral VIII, this a public hearing in the matter of the following applications for permits under the wetland ordinance of the Town of Southold. I have an affidavit of publication from the Suffolk Times. Pertinent correspondence may be read prior to asking for comments from the public.

I would remind you at this time to please keep your comments organized and brief. I would also like to remind you at this time that should an application be approved and you hire a contractor to conduct the work, that contractor must have a Southold Town Coastal license. This has been in effect since January, under the contractor law.

I'll make a motion to go off our public hearing agenda and go into the public hearing.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

## **AMENDMENTS:**

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Number one, under Amendments, J.M.O Environmental Consulting on behalf of **BRADLEY M. ANDERSON** requests an Amendment to Wetland permit #5649 to install a 3'x16' adjustable ramp and a 6'x20' floating dock secured by (4) piles to be situated in an "L" configuration off of the side of

the fixed dock.

Located: 1095 Emerson Road, Southold. SCTM# 1000-86-3-1

On May 9th the Trustees did a field inspection and the notes indicate that it's a straightforward application, not more than one-third of the way across the channel, and there was no pier line conflict.

The LWRP coordinator found this to be consistent.

And the Conservation Advisory Council resolved to support this application.

Is there anyone here to speak to this application?

(Negative response).

Any questions or comments from the Board?

(Negative response).

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Hearing none, I make a motion to close this hearing.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

I make a motion to approve this application as submitted.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

#### **WETLAND & COASTAL EROSION PERMITS:**

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: The next application, under Wetland & Coastal Erosion Permits, number one, this is initially advertised as DKR Shores, Inc., on behalf of Marijo Adimey and Veronica Lugris, now represented by Patricia Moore of counsel, on behalf of **MARIJO C. ADIMEY & VERONICA M. LUGRIS** requests a Wetland Permit and a Coastal Erosion Permit to remove and replace in-place 84' of existing vinyl bulkhead with new steel sheet piling bulkhead; install two (2) 20' long returns; backfill disturbed area with 45 cubic yards of clean fill from an upland source; re-vegetate disturbed areas with Cape American beach grass and native species of shrubs; temporarily remove and replace in-place existing bluff stairs with two (2) 12'x16' decks; reconstruct existing 4'x5' cantilevered platform and aluminum beach access stairs; and install French drains at top of bluff to reduce rain runoff on the bluff face. Located: 21515 Soundview Avenue, Southold. SCTM# 1000-135-1-5.

The Trustees had previously opened the public hearing in this matter. Subsequent to the public hearing, the Board has received a letter of permission from neighbors Vasilakis -- Florence Vasilakis and Dimitris Vasilakis for access through their property to conduct the activities with a hold-harmless agreement for the Town.

The project description was modified on April 19th, and by inclusion, I'll include this by reference into the project description for tonight, there were minor changes, but it was to, it was submitted and stamped in April 19th, the day after

our monthly meeting. And it indicates would be to reconstruct the 84' linear feet of existing storm-damaged fiberglass bulkhead to be replaced with steel sheath in accordance with Chesterfield plans dated 3/23/18, raising the height of the bulkhead by 18 inches, or as permitted by the DEC; install 20 feet of new steel returns within the property lines, required on the west side; but on the east side of the return shall be not necessary if the continuous bulkhead permit, which will be pending, and that's next month, and backfill the structures with 100 cubic yards of clean fill with stone splash pad immediately landward of the bulkhead; existing two 12x16' decks and stairs removed temporarily and replaced on new support posts; replace the 4x6' cantilevered platform with removable, aluminum beach access steps; re-plant the area with Cape American beach grass, two-inch plugs, 12-inches on center, along with native shrubs; install French drain in accordance with the plans created by Creative Environmental Design 3/21/18, with 12-inch diameter coir logs, (2) two-foot by 12 foot ACQ treated wood; 2"x4"x5' ACQ timber set at four-foot at center as stakes for the 2x12' coir logs; erosion jute and Cape American beach grass, which is for the slopes of the project leading down to the proposed bulkhead; drainage of the house is to be redirected to the front yard by a four-inch perforated ADS drainage pipe as French drains. And raise the height of the steel bulkhead the maximum permitted by DEC, up to 18 inches.

The project was deemed inconsistent under the LWRP for which there are many, numerous items that we discussed at the last hearing, and tonight we'll hopefully bring it into consistency.

And I believe we previously read into the record the position of the Conservation Advisory Council, that they were not particularly in favor of the project.

Is there anyone here who wishes to speak to this application?  
MS. MOORE: Yes. Patricia Moore on behalf of the applicant. We do have additional memos and correspondence in your file that was presented before the last meeting regarding the history of the existing deck and stairway. So given all of the correspondence and documentation in your file, I would hope that this project can be approved as it has been revised, amended, as of April 19th. Thank you.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: The Board again visited the project site on May 9th. The Board still has, and discussed it again at our Work session, the Board still has strong feelings concerning that the lower deck should in fact be removed and be placed at grade level with a 30-year fastening for now or ticos. Because we, with the wave force there that we noted, which included after recent winter storms including water that went over the house and killed shrubbery in the front of the house that was on Soundview Avenue, that the Board feels strongly that under the Coastal Erosion Hazard Area ordinance that we should be tucking the deck in behind the silhouette, if you will, of the expanded steel bulkhead. And since that is going higher, that would

afford a place so this structure would not likely become a projectile in a storm. Seeing as the neighbors' decks were also, you know, removed and essentially smashed and pushed landward during storm events.

And the upper deck, the Board feels it should be, the surface should be replaced with through-flow and, as I believe there will be further discussion, but with the new project description we were thinking possibly a French drain near the top of the bluff and rerouting the drainage back. I don't know if that's part of the initial discussion. And we would like to have -- so the French drains was a weak iteration.

MS. MOORE: If I could speak, when you are ready.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Okay, go ahead.

MS. MOORE: As I pointed out previously, the 12x16 deck that actually survived all the storms is an existing condition. It has a long history of permitting. And my client feels very strongly that when she purchased this property, a significant reason she bought this property was the existence of that 12x16 deck. The property next door, when the deck was lost in the storm, obviously at that point subject to your review for reconstruction. At this point, the structures that remained are the 12x16 lower deck and the 12x16 upper deck. So at this point in time, we were suggesting since it could be lifted as an entirety, just moved out of the way as I pointed out previously, for safety and security of the contractors, it would make sense to set it aside. And that was the method that it was replaced when the McDonalds' owned the property there. There is actually that, which was written into the permit. So my client is, as a matter of law, it's a permitted structure. So if we left it just where it is, it's a permitted structure. I think that it would make sense that for the safety of the contractors to set it to the side. But it means so much to my client. She will leave it right where it is and Chesterfield is prepared to work around it. It's not the best solution but if that's what you force us to do, we are prepared to do it. I think that given the history, the long history of the permits of this property you've got, this being the third permit that recognizes that that deck may remain. That's a very significant issue.

Also, the objections by the neighbor who was putting the staircase on that right-of-way, really are irrelevant. That right-of-way he gained later. My client purchased the property with right-of-way issues that ultimately the title company had to resolve. They had put in their stairs and they have chosen not to listen and repair their bulkhead. But that's their choice. So their decision making should not impact my client's project. As it is, there is great cooperation occurring between Vasilakis and my clients. Vasilakis' permit will be on next month. It's the same contractor. It's a coordinated effort. And so far, as I said, it's a very important part of this property, and she has vested rights to this deck. It is something that as a matter of law, as I said, it's a permitted structure.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Is it possible because the underpinnings, the supports were showing, you know, severe damage, the deck itself was, not all the posts --

MS. MOORE: The posts were fine.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I don't know that it's functional. You certainly could not access the beach via the deck and the steps.

MS. MOORE: Which steps are you talking about?

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: The lower deck. We were just there. It's in place but it's unusable. There is nothing underneath it. How is that --

MS. MOORE: Are you sure you are looking at the right one?

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: That's not the house. Because they'll have to remove the deck. What if we were to get a supplementary plan of larger posts to withstand -- the Coastal Erosion Hazard Act wants a 30-year maintenance.

MS. MOORE: If those posts have to be replaced with a wider, that's fine.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: I'm talking about scheduling larger posts to meet the 30 --

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I'm just motioning to Liz to click one more.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: In other words instead of it being on dimensional lumber, which it is, go up to, in other words, you have Chesterfield there, have them go with six to eight foot. And all stainless steel Ticos and stainless steel fastenings. To tie it all together

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: If I can speak. We are talking about raising the bulkhead 18 inches. The deck is currently roughly three feet to five feet above that. We are not saying you can't have a deck, we just, for public safety and common sense, to move the deck down to shelter it behind the new steel bulkhead.

MS. MOORE: The new steel bulkhead is not going to be that high. It's from grade, so it's a foot. The 18 inches, I have a photograph, so if maybe --

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: You may approach, yes.

MS. MOORE: Thank you. So that's where the bulkhead is now. That's the -- that's it.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: This is it. This picture was taken quite some time ago. There is no more dirt behind this.

MS. MOORE: No, the loss of dirt is on this side.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: The stairs are hanging. I was just there. I would not go on the stairs for fear they would fall and I would get injured. This deck was shaky. It's not safe.

MS. MOORE: I don't know what to tell you as far as what it is today because I was there two weeks ago, so.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: I understand your client's desire, but from moving forward, from a safety standpoint, in looking at the storms that happened this past winter with the wave action hitting that bulkhead, will jettison the water right into that deck, and a loose plank will go right through her house.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: After these winter storms I don't even know why this is even still a discussion. I mean, if you look at properties --

MS. MOORE: Because as a matter of law we are entitled to it.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: If it's functional.



MS. MOORE: If you need a letter saying it's functional, I'll get you a letter saying it's functional. Our problem is we have to replace the bulkhead. The bulkhead has --

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I want to see a letter, then. Wasn't there a gate --

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: The gate was blocking off access.

MS. MOORE: The gate was at the top for the dogs.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: The gate was at the top of the stairs.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Pat, during this storm season, I did not go on this site but I went to the town beach and I looked at this property. And then I drove on Soundview. The waves were crashing and you can see the damage that they did, in going over the house and spray was landing on the road, Soundview. There was evidence of that because all the plants that were put in by your client had saltwater damage. The point I'm trying to make is that this is an extremely high-energy area, and that energy, contrary to your point of view, made that deck and that staircase non-functional. I would not go on it when we were there last. So I very strongly want to see this area repaired, that the lower deck should be put on grade simply to try to make it, help it survive in the next event that occurs. Which hopefully won't be in my lifetime.

MS. MOORE: Well, I understand your point. It's, as far as she understands from the contractors, she can reuse a great deal of the stairs and the deck and the entire structure. And the plan was not to replace the entire thing. If we start replacing its height and so on, then you are changing the length, the width, the configuration of the stairs.

So this whole event has been very costly to my client and she is trying to preserve as much as she can. So, would she be willing to place greater supports? Yes. I think that that makes sense. But to lower it, you are actually putting the whole deck more into harm's way because you are putting it right, you have the new bulkhead, you have the rock on top, and then you are going to put the deck on top of that rock. You are actually putting it more in harm's way than it is right now.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: That's an opinion.

MS. MOORE: But you are lowering it.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: I disagree with that opinion. We are not saying you can't have a deck. We are just asking the deck be dropped down slightly to be on-grade, to be protected by the bulkhead. Inevitably, there will be more storms. And we are just trying to help mitigate future work on the site, because if a storm comes and damages the deck, there will be more post stub, there will be, you know. Our concern is for the property owner to do it right, do it once, and keep it that way. We are not saying you can't have the deck. We simply want it in a safer spot. We are not saying you can't have the upper deck. So, you know, obviously there will be work there. Yes, they'll reconfigure the stairs a little bit to go down to the lower deck, then there won't be need for an auxiliary set of stairs to go down further, that would be on-grade.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: I would like to point out as Trustee Williams pointed out before. You are going to raise the bulkhead, so putting the lower deck on-grade is a matter of maybe one or two steps needed to be added to the staircase. I don't think that should be the breaking point for this decision. It's not going to be tens of thousands of dollars.

MS. MOORE: It looks more to me like five steps. Maybe when the grade is raised and the bulkhead is raised. I'm trying to visualize what it's going to be today. So.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Due to the absence of dirt at the last site inspection we were not able to measure and get accurate measurements. But again, it appeared to be roughly four feet above what was grade there.

MS. MOORE: Yes, it's about four feet above grade.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: So if you raise the bulkhead a foot, you drop the deck three feet. We are not saying you can't have the deck. We just want to drop it three feet. Because the other side, if it is rebuilt to higher standards, it's going to cost more than just dropping it and putting the two steps in.

MS. MOORE: What is your suggestion? It sounds like you are thinking --

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Thinking out loud now. Because functionality is a question, and the Board has brought it into question. We are discussing at this point that you get a letter from a licensed design professional that would affirm or attest to the functionality of it, and/or in the alternative that the new project plans be brought in with respect to locating it on-grade with beefed-up fastenings and stainless steel, and that those fastenings also might be included in the, if you get a letter from the licensed design professional, their design recommendation as far as beefing up the existing structure that it is deemed to be structurally sound. So your options -- provide an option that would include license design professionals.

MS. MOORE: So to keep the deck as it is high, you want a letter that the deck is still functional in its current state.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: And licensed design professional will provide very specific details on strengthening it. Because it's coming out and will be replaced, and that will be the time to strengthen the underpinnings.

MS. MOORE: So the first option, as it is now, height, we have to verify through a professional that it's functional as it is today. In lieu of that, if we can't find somebody or you are correct that it's not functional, then we get, it will be brought down to grade but with, you want some additional structural upgrade.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Basically to the 30 year standard, which will include, in other words stainless steel Ticos; in other words the fastenings probably found in my experience in Rabbit Lane after the hurricane, Tropical Storm Sandy, was fastenings blew apart and decks came out and went through people's living rooms.

MR. HAGAN: That has to be done in a motion with a vote of the Board.

MS. MOORE: He's just explaining it to me, so.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: If that's acceptable

MS. MOORE: That's fine. One way or another, she can have it, you just need documentation one way or the other. Okay.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Counsel has advised me that I have marched the Board down a blind alley.

In an attempt, on advice of counsel, we should really get the letter concerning the design professional's review that the structure is functional and that the Board would review that document before we would then render a determination on the matter, if it's not functional. So we would really have to table and wait for that document unless --

MS. MOORE: Because I have a Chesterfield that is scheduled for the beginning of June. So is it possible, Damon, to do it as a condition of the permit so I can get you the document?

MR. HAGAN: No, you can't, because you had essentially three options that have been presented to you.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I'm not comfortable with that regardless of the Condition.

MS. MOORE: We'll, you are going to vote no.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Not necessarily. But conditioning, I'm not comfortable with that regardless.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Isn't Chesterfield doing the other permit next month?

MS. MOORE: He is. So, we'll, what we were going to do is just deal with the Vasilakis ten feet to be able to work on this area because by the time the June permit is issued, the Vasilakis rest of the project will continue. We have been waiting to work on this because obviously the house is the most important thing to protect, and because of the monthly schedule, we thought it was going to be approved last month, and the landscape plan I guess somehow or other, it got to you, but I don't know when it got to you. It was -- I was not in charge. Dave Chicanowicz delivered it, and for some reason you didn't get it, so.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: I would like to reiterate my concerns about the deck being on-grade. I cannot overstate or express my regard to the energy that I saw during that storm. And if this, if the neighbor's deck disappeared, I'm trying to avoid that. By putting it down lower, in back of the bulkhead, there is less opportunity for waves to get underneath and flip it. Which it has demonstrated next door that it can do. So I'm strongly, unless this is modified, I'm inclined to vote no on this.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Okay, is there anyone else who wishes to speak to this application?

Any additional comments from Board members?

(Negative response).

I would make a motion to close the hearing in this matter.

MS. MOORE: I thought we were tabling it.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Well, if we are going to table at the

request of the applicant, if you are going to get us a letter.

MR. HAGAN: With the understanding that the letter is not binding. You are looking for a letter that potentially would be reviewed by the Board to aid in their decision.

MS. MOORE: Right. So it doesn't make sense to close it.

MS. MOORE: I don't want to end up with a no because that would damage the property, if that's where we are. So I know your preferences, I know my job, which is it's a permitted structure, and, you know, you should leave it up to the applicant when it's a permitted structure or whether, do they leave it where it is or do they lower it. I understand your recommendations, but, you know, there is a certain legal right that people have to permitted structures. Otherwise why would we all come to you to permit structures. So if we have to adjourn it, you know, I know this was very important to her. I thought this was all worked out based on our previous work session, based on our previous meetings. This is all kind of a surprise to me we are at this point, three months later. So she couldn't be here. If she was here, what I could do, could we put this in, give me a chance to call her and I'll put it back so at least I can consult with her, if she says all right, let's bring it down, at least we can move this along. If I can't reach her, I can't reach her.

MR. HAGAN: The Board is empowered to be able to call another matter out of order and return to this prior to the conclusion of this meeting.

MS. MOORE: If I may, please, request just a short adjournment.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: If that's all right with the Board.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: I'll make a motion to suspend this hearing at this point to be discussed at a later point in this meeting.

MS. MOORE: That's fine. Thank you, very much.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

MR. HAGAN: This application is currently suspended, to be recalled at a later time tonight.

MS. MOORE: Thank you.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Under Wetland Permits, number two, Costello Marine Contracting Corp. on behalf of **GARDINERS BAY ESTATES CLUB, c/o ROY OLSEN** requests a Wetland Permit to dredge a 25'x300' channel to EL. -4.0' below mean water.

Located: Spring Pond, East Marion. SCTM# 1000-37-4-17

The LWRP has found this to be consistent, noting all intertidal construction and excavation requires the installation of a silt boom.

The Conservation Advisory Council resolved to support this application.

The Trustees performed a field inspection on May 9th, recommending that the spoil be used to fill behind the low sill bulkhead and replant edge by that Fox Island. Is there anyone here who wishes to speak regarding this application?

(Negative response).

Any questions or comments from the Board?

(Negative response).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Hearing no further comments, I'll make a motion to close this hearing.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I'll make a motion to approve this application with the condition that a silt boom be used during construction and a recommendation that the spoils be used to re-grade behind the low sill bulkhead.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Number three, Michael Kimack on behalf of **860 BAYVIEW DRIVE, LLC** requests a Wetland Permit for the existing 1 & ½ story dwelling with attached garage (2,314.7sq.ft. footprint); construct a 190.8sq.ft. addition to existing dwelling; construct a 254.4sq.ft. pavilion attached to addition; construct a 900sq.ft. swimming pool; construct a 1,766sq.ft. pool patio and outdoor kitchen area; install approximately 55' of French drain connected to three (3) 8'x13' drywells; construct approximately 88' of retaining wall surrounding the pool, pool patio, and new addition which is to be of varying height with 5' being the highest.

Located: 860 Bayview Drive, East Marion. SCTM# 1000-37-5-10.1

The LWRP coordinator found this to be consistent.

The Conservation Advisory Council resolved not to support this application due to setbacks. Not meeting required setbacks is the note there.

The Trustees last visited this site on March 14th, and noted that it was straightforward. Most recently it was discussed at work session, and I believe the only issue was that the Trustees saw it was a pipe which had been discussed last meeting.

Is there anyone here that wishes to speak regarding this application?

MR. KIMACK: Michael Kimack on behalf of the applicant. Thank you. There were actually two issues that you had brought up. One was the pipe. I didn't remember but I had gotten a letter from Zoning which you now have in your portfolio.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Yes.

MR. KIMACK: It's a community pipe that drains Bayview Drive through a couple of catch basins. When I wrote the letter that time, I think there was an expectation that was they were working with the Town. I did note in that letter that he didn't hook into that, he has his own drywell system. So he's not part of it. It simply runs through the property and drains off.

The other thing you requested to me was to provide a revised survey showing a ten-foot buffer, which has been

delivered. It's also in your portfolio. Those are the two issues.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Thank you, very much. Is there anyone else here that wishes to speak regarding this application?

(Negative response).

Any additional comments from the Board?

(Negative response).

Hearing none, I make a motion to close the hearing.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: And I make a motion to approve this application.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

MR. KIMACK: Thank you, very much.

MR. HAGAN: In light of past discussions, Mr. President, I think it's best we continue to take matters out of order and go to number seven under Wetland Permits, in light of four, five and six.

We can call them out of order if you are still on the phone.

MS. MOORE: Yes, I'm still on the phone. Thank you.

MR. HAGAN: Mr. President, in light of what we just have been informed by Counsel Moore, perhaps you would like to continue to call matters out of order.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Absolutely. Number seven, McCarthy Management, Inc., is the next application.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Under Wetland Permits, number seven, McCarthy Management, Inc., on behalf of **TIMOTHY CASAMENTO & KLEO KING** request a Wetland Permit to construct an 85'10" x 60'3" one-story, single family dwelling with a 1,370sq.ft. wrap-around covered porch; a new sanitary system; and a new 12'x12' shed. Located: 2667 Long Creek Drive, Southold. SCTM# 1000-52-9-1.2

The Trustees visited this site on May 9th, 2018. The field notes indicate Trustees present were Mr. Bredemeyer, Mr. Goldsmith, Mr. Domino, Mr. Krupski and myself. Field notes, okay as per plans.

The LWRP found this project to be consistent.

The Conservation Advisory Council moved to support this project.

Is there anyone here who wishes to speak on this application?

(Negative response).

Any comments from the Board?

MS. NORTON: My name is Angela Norton, I am an adjoining landowner and have recorded covenants and restrictions with Suffolk County, not with the Town of Southold, and the design on this house is not what was required in my C&Rs, so I do have some concerns over this project. Um, can I approach?

Do you have this survey?

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Is that the mapping survey of this?

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: You can bring it up. Is it a survey of the house?

MS. NORTON: Yes.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: What's the date of the survey (Perusing). Yes, we do have this.

MS. NORTON: Okay.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: What are your concerns?

MS. NORTON: Is that in the covenants and restrictions, once again recorded with Suffolk, one of the C&Rs is that there should be no direct, the driveway should not directly enter into the garage. And on this, it appears that this is a separate garage from the house.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: It appears that way, yes.

MS. NORTON: That's my concern.

MR. HAGAN: I believe that the comments, if you are asking for an interpretation of C&Rs that are filed with Suffolk County of this Board, they are not empowered to make such an interpretation, which has been verified by recent cases, specifically the Perry case.

MS. NORTON: Okay, I understand. I just wanted to --

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Concerns regarding, again, as the Board of Trustees we are here to oversee the wetlands. Are there any concerns regarding the wetlands or is it --

MS. NORTON: No, that was my land. I sold it to the Casamentos. Anyway, I just wanted to come forward to meet most of you gentlemen because I don't know you.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Now you do.

MS. NORTON: Thank you, so much, on this rainy day, and have a lovely evening.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: You as well. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak to this application?

(Negative response).

At this point, I make a motion to close the public hearing.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: I make a motion to approve the application as written.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Number eight, Robert Brown Architects on behalf of **STUART & JOYCE NEWMAN** requests a Wetland Permit for the existing 1,357.2sq.ft. Single-family dwelling with existing decks totaling 621.0sq.ft.; construct a 515sq.ft. landward addition with a 177.5sq.ft. covered porch; construct a 396sq.ft. second-floor addition with an attached 94sq.ft. deck; and to remove the existing non-conforming 125sq.ft. deck located on the easterly side yard.

Located: 56425 Route 48, Greenport. SCTM# 1000-44-1-24

The LWRP coordinator found this to be exempt.

The Conservation Advisory Council resolved not to support this application. The Conservation Advisory Council does not support the project as applied for, recommending that they move the cesspools.

The Trustees visited this site on the 9th and noted that there would have to be a minimum of a 15-foot non-turf buffer. And aside from that, no other comments.

Is there anyone here that wishes to speak regarding this application?

MR. BROWN: Robert Brown, architect for the applicant. First I would like to point out in terms of the cesspools we do have an application with the Health Department to move the cesspool and septic system to the front of the house. Which I believe is also indicated on the site plan that you have. Also, that all of the work proposed here is landward of the existing structure.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Okay, thank you. Is there anyone else that wishes to speak regarding this application?

(No response).

Any comments from the Board?

TRUSTEE DOMINO: I would like to make the comment that this particular property many years ago in conjunction with neighbors, built a long revetment. It seemed to work beautifully in that area. And in back of that, the vegetation that is there, we are asking for a 15-foot non-turf buffer. I would not like to see that vegetation disturbed because it's doing its job beautifully right now.

MR. BROWN: My clients have no interest in disturbing anything that they don't have to.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Excellent. Good thought there.

Is there anyone else that wishes to speak regarding this application?

(Negative response).

I make a motion to close this hearing.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I make a motion to approve with the stipulation of a 15-foot non-turf buffer as existing.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

MR. BROWN: Thank you, very much.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Number nine, Robert Wilson on behalf of **JOHN & DANIELLA VENETIS** request a Wetland Permit to replace existing 72' long wood bulkhead with new vinyl bulkhead in-place.

Located: 2600 Takaposha Road, Southold. SCTM# 1000-87-6-4

The Trustees did a field inspection on May 9th, and the notes say it might be advisable to schedule a pre-submission to discuss with the agent or the client the bulkhead alternatives.

The LWRP coordinator found this to be exempt.



The Conservation Advisory Council resolved to support the application.

Is there anyone here to speak to this application?

MR. WILSON: Robert Wilson on behalf of John and Daniella Venetis.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Robert, could you speak to the suggestion that there might be other -- we are assuming that you are not questioning the functionality of the bulkhead that is there, that you want to replace it. So it's obviously not functional or working or it's recently near the end of its lifespan.

MR. WILSON: It's near the end of its lifespan.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: As you can see from the photograph, it's extensive erosion. There is no vegetation at all in front of this, whereas there is on the property adjacent to it. And in fact there are no other bulkheads in the vicinity. So it was, there are several different thoughts on the Board, but some of us thought that perhaps removing the bulkhead is a good idea, but not putting it back would be an improvement.

MR. BROWN: I understand and I would be interested to know what the alternatives the Board of Trustees is suggesting. If we have to, the client is willing to schedule or probably will schedule the work session to meet with the Trustees and discuss it, but, um, everyone is very anxious to get this project moving, so we thought we would come here tonight and see what the Trustees' ideas were.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: The stated purpose of a pre-submission is to have a dialogue and to discuss alternatives, and it's a freer environment than the one we are working in right now.

MR. WILSON: I understand, yes.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: So if in fact you do, and as you stated, wanted to discuss alternatives, that would be a better venue for you than right now.

MR. WILSON: Okay. If we were to go ahead and request a decision tonight, is the Board inclined to vote no?

Can I ask that?

TRUSTEE DOMINO: We can't answer that question.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: It may be advisable for you to request us to table the application and then request an onsite discussion.

MR. BROWN: I know that's exactly what the client is trying to avoid.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: It's an option. Or you can ask that we render a decision this evening. That's up to you.

MR. BROWN: I think we are going to lose the month anyway. I think we'll go ahead and take our chances with your decision tonight, and if we have to, if the Trustees deny the application, we can resubmit an application and then have the work session and, yes, okay.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: When it's voted down, you have to start anew. There is no forgiveness on the application fees, there is a whole new, just so you understand.

MR. WILSON: Okay.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Does anyone else wish to speak to this

application?

(Negative response).

Hearing none, I make a motion to close this hearing.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE DOMINO: I make a motion to deny this application as submitted.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Is that denied without prejudice?

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Yes, sir.

MR. HAGAN: Can we have the motion reiterated, for the record?

TRUSTEE DOMINO: I make a motion to deny without prejudice, the application as submitted.

MR. HAGAN: Is there a second?

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

MR. HAGAN: Mr. President, with your permission, I think we should go back to the previous matter that was essentially second-called, which is number one under Wetland and Coastal Erosion Permits, DKR Shores on behalf of Marijo Adimey and Veronica Lugris who are now being represented by Patricia Moore.

MS. MOORE: Thank you. Okay, I had a long conversation with my client. She is quite upset, obviously because, to begin with, the deck that is there is fully functional. It is very sturdy.

The problem here was that the bluff went out, not that that structure, that the bulkhead that is there is what was damaged. And the photograph you keep showing is the neighbor's property. My client's property had a tear in the bulkhead and the sand began to leave. So you can see that that is actually on the west side of the property. That is not where the deck is either.

So the deck is still there. The structure is still there. It's fully functional and it is, in particular, one of the things she wanted me to point out is that this restoration is, if the deck is brought down, what happens is that the waves are going to crash on top of the deck and damage it more than when the deck is elevated. The deck as an elevated structure was staying out of the area of the storm activity and it was more protected. So she feels contrary, based on her living there and having lived through these storms, that it is actually more protected.

Secondly, the fact is that the neighbors got an access point that they would never have gotten had the right-of-way remained as it is. So now you have all of Clark Beach hanging out, and essentially when it's all on the same level, if she is not there, you have Clark property owners that are going to end up using her property as their private beach area. So the fact that it's elevated gives it some privacy as far as how they use the property.

And more importantly, just, you know, when a person buys a property, they are very careful to make sure the structures are permitted. And there is a very strong reason for that, which is, if it's a permitted structure, it has protection. That is how she bought this property. With a permitted structure. In particular, with the three permits that have been previously issued with identical circumstances where the bulkhead, with storm damage, the bulkhead had to be replaced, and the deck withstood all those storm damage. So it's very important to her. If it was something that could be acquiesced to, believe me, she would acquiesce. But it is extremely important and really the beauty of this property.

So if the Board wants her to add supports or add a 30-year construction standard, we think it's already there because the posts, when they were replaced ten years ago, are extremely sturdy. They are wider and thicker than most of the support structures that you see for the decks. But if you want additional supports, by all means, she is willing to do that. Chesterfield is ready to start. The property needs to be restored. It's very important. We don't want to delay it another month. So if you are going to vote, vote as you have to. As a matter of law, we have a permitted structure and are hoping you will honor that the way the code describes it, so.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Patricia, we recognize it was permitted, and that's why we are willing to let it stay. We want it lowered for safety. The deck is there. The ground underneath it is not. This is not functional. That's the extent of my comments

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Any additional comments from the Board?

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I mean, I just, is this a good project. I hate to, the discussion is over three feet. That is really what we are talking about here.

MS. MOORE: I understand. As I said, do what you are going to do. I don't want to see it, I mean the other option is we hold off, that we remove the deck from this permit. It has a permit. We remove it from this project, we'll come back in and address just the deck. And I'll come back with an engineering letter that shows you that the functional is not the ground below it, it's the structure. So I would respectfully disagree. Functional is the structure itself. Not when the ground, because of the bluff erosion goes out. It's the structure itself. So, you know, we are keeping it functional.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: We have an application before us that has already gone through modification. I don't think we can do that. I think I would like to draw this to a close.

MS. MOORE: Okay.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Any additional comments?  
(Negative response).

Not seeing any, I make a motion to close this hearing.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: I would make a motion to approve this application with the stipulation that the lower deck be located on-grade behind the new proposed steel bulkhead. Repeating the concerns of the chairman that safety requirements of the Coastal Erosion Hazard Area ordinance to try to minimize damage to lateral lands from ejecting and noting that we have not denied decks for this property. We are providing an opportunity to maintain it on the site. That's my motion.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

MS. MOORE: Thank you.

MR. HAGAN: At this time, Mr. President, I recommend possibly going on break and with the understanding that Trustee Williams will not be returning after the break, based on a previous commitment that he has. And we'll still have a quorum.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: At this time we'll take a five-minute recess.

(After a recess these proceedings continue as follows).

(Trustee Domino, Trustee Bredemeyer, Trustee Goldsmith and Trustee Krupski are present. Trustee Williams is not present).

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: We are back on the record, noting for the record Trustee Williams has left for the evening.

And we are back returning to agenda item number four under Wetland permits, Patricia C. Moore, Esq., on behalf of **ORIENT ACRES, LLC, c/o EVA MALLIS, LLC MEMBER** requests a Wetland Permit for the existing 3,456sq.ft. two-story dwelling with a 304sq.ft. front entry patio area, a 146sq.ft. garage roof extension, a 143sq.ft. master bedroom deck area, and a 198sq.ft. second floor deck; propose to construct a 285sq.ft. east side addition; construct a 146sq.ft. landward side addition; construct a 148sq.ft. front covered entry patio area; construct a 146sq.ft. garage front roof extension; construct a 235sq.ft. screened porch on north side of dwelling; existing 1,248sq.ft. seaward side deck area to be reduced in size to be an 858sq.ft. deck area (to be resurfaced) in order to accommodate additions; and construct a 328sq.ft. roof over seaward side deck area. Located: 32625 Main Road, Orient. SCTM# 1000-14-2-25

This application has been deemed to be consistent under the LWRP.

Trustees performed a field inspection last month. I believe we were in the process of holding for plans for the deck.

Is there anyone here that wishes to speak to this application?

MS. MOORE: Patricia Moore on behalf of Orient Acres.

The deck and the stairs were built prior to Trustees jurisdiction. I'm trying to get the, to scale of those of the deck and stairs, but unfortunately Young & Young couldn't provide that for me. I checked with Mark Schwartz who was doing

the renovation of the house. So what I would suggest is I'll come back and amend the permit just for the deck and stairs to make sure it gets a permit. But then I can get somebody to draw it for me with the dimensions. I mean, it's existing. Um, and one month won't make a difference or two months won't make a difference for an existing structure.

The house is being renovated, so they would like to get started on that renovation sooner than later.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: The Board did not have any problems with this at both field inspection discussions. It's just a matter of trying to carry forward and updating the property so those structures would be included.

And the Conservation Advisory Council supports the application with a 15-foot non-turf buffer of native plantings. It has a native buffer there. We request to maintain a 15-foot non-turf buffer, if that's not a problem for that location.

MS. MOORE: The vegetation that is there is already a certain width.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: There is already a vegetation there. It is non-turf and it's already 15 feet. It would be a matter of maintaining what is there.

MS. MOORE: Maintaining what is there, okay, fine.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: It was straightforward on field inspection. Are there any questions from the Board?

(Negative response).

Does anyone else wish to speak to this application?

(No response).

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: I make a motion to close the hearing in this matter.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: I make a motion to approve as submitted.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Number five, Patricia C. Moore, Esq., on behalf of **BIM E. STRASBERG & ALEXANDRA M. LEWIS** request a Wetland Permit to construct a set of bluff stairs consisting of a 4'x8' top landing to 4'x9' steps to a 4'x4' middle landing to 4'x8' stairs to a 4'x6' middle landing to 4'x8' stairs to a 4'x4' lower landing to 4'x8' stairs to beach.

Located: 21225 Soundview Avenue, Southold. SCTM# 1000-135-1-1

The Trustees did a field inspection on May 9th, suggested that stairs might be a possibility but it should follow the new bulkhead, which accordingly was taken care of.

The LWRP found this to be consistent.

The CAC resolved unanimously to not support the application because the project was not staked and is inconsistent with LWRP policy standard 4.1(a)(2), minimize loss of human life and

structures from flooding and erosion.

MS. MOORE: Are we sure we are at the right property? Because it was staked, so.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Patricia. I'm reading it. That was dated March 14th. Perhaps --

MS. MOORE: It may not have been by then.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Perhaps it was staked after that.

Is there anyone here to speak to this application?

MS. MOORE: Patricia Moore on behalf of Bim Strasberg and Alexandra Lewis. This is a situation where the seller, the prior owner sold to Bim and -- to the two new owners. We agreed that we would undertake an application for stairs. We prepared that application and, unfortunately for the new owners, the storms damaged the bulkhead after closing. So I have informed them that they have damage to their bulkhead. They are in the process of investigating contractors and how to get access. So they certainly do not want to spend money on stairs until it is protected with a bulkhead. But my obligation as the seller's attorney was to complete this process. So I would ask that we get this permit, the owners agree wholeheartedly that they'll repair or replace the bulkhead. They are just trying to coordinate that, and part of the problem is access here between the rock on the shoreline that gives limited access by barge to Costello or another company, and the access from the top, which you need permission from neighbors. And one of the neighbors is MIA until the summer. So there is a delay there. They're working on it. So.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Any questions or comments from the Board? (Negative response).

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Anyone else wish to speak to this application? (Negative response).

Hearing none, I make a motion to close this hearing.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE DOMINO: I make a motion to approve this application as submitted.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Number six, Patricia C. Moore, Esq. on behalf of **DIMITRIOS & IRENE ANTONIADIS** requests a Wetland Permit to expand the existing sanitary system's leaching pools with new chamber and an expansion pool, and new septic tank.

Located: 3300 North Sea Drive, Orient. SCTM# 1000-15-1-4

The LWRP found this to be inconsistent. The inconsistency, minimize loss of human life and structures from flooding and erosion hazards. The closest leaching pool to the coastal erosion hazard line is 19 feet, and is approximately 50 feet from the top of the bluff.

The Conservation Advisory Council supports the application.

Trustee Williams conducted a field inspection on May 13th, noting that it looked straightforward.

Is there anyone here who wishes to speak regarding this application?

MS. MOORE: Yes, Patricia Moore behalf of the Antoniadis family. This was previously approved for an addition to the house, and during, when they were ready to submit, they realized that the existing sanitary needed an additional leaching pool.

The Health Department regulations required a certain distance sanitary to wells, and in this area of Orient, sanitary has to be in one location, wells are on another. So this was the only alternative for the expanded leaching pool. So it's just to make the existing sanitary system conform to current Health Department regulations.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Is there anyone else who wishes to speak regarding this application?

MR. KEHL: Brett Kehl. I note on there there is two pre-existing cesspools and we'll actually take off the dome covers, replace two-foot covers on top, add another cesspool leaching ring and then we have to go and put a septic tank in. But as Pat said, we can't put it anywhere else on the property. We've tried everything.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: And looking at these plans, it looks like the new ones are going further landward than the existing.

MS. MOORE: Yes, it's further landward.

MR. KEHL: That's the septic tank that is going landward, but the one all the way to the west is the new one we have to put in because we have to stay away from the property line.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: That's still further away from the bluff.

MR. KEHL: Yes.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Is there anyone else here who wishes to speak regarding this application?

(Negative response).

Any questions or comments from the Board?

(Negative response).

Hearing none, I make a motion to close this hearing.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I make a motion to approve this application with the note that they are constricted with where they can place the new septic system, and it's going further landward than the existing, and thereby bringing it into consistency with the LWRP.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: The next application, number ten, Suffolk Environmental Consulting on behalf of **GEORGE & DEBRA CORITSIDIS**

request a Wetland Permit to implement a stormwater management plan consisting of the installation of two (2) 8'x3' drywells at the southwestern and northeastern corners of the existing dwelling; re-grade the as-built driveway and install a 250'x3' gravel French drain; remove existing boulders installed along the wetland boundary; re-grade an approximate 1,750sq.ft. area and plant with Marsh Elder (*Iva frutescens*) adjacent to wetland boundary and American Beach grass (*Ammophila brevifolia*). Located: 1800 Cedar Beach Road & 265 Orchard Lane, Southold. SCTM# 1000-89-2-3 & 1000-89-2-5.1

This application has been deemed to be consistent under the LWRP.

The Board has made numerous site inspections. The Town's Engineering Department has reviewed the drainage plans for the site, for the as-built driveway, and the Board met with the Suffolk Environmental Consulting, the principal, Bruce Anderson, on May 9th, to discuss the restoration of the removal of the boulders and the area of native plantings.

Is there anyone here who wishes to speak to this application?

MR. ANDERSON: Bruce Anderson, Suffolk Environmental Consulting for the applicant. I really don't have anything to add. This has gone through a lot, so in the interest of brevity I'll answer any other questions you may have.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Any questions from the Board?  
(Negative response).

It was a good plan. Field inspection revealed a good project plan for remediating a site that had problems.

Anyone else wish to speak to this application?  
(Negative response).

Seeing no one stepping forth, I'll make a motion to close the hearing in this matter.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: I would make a motion to approve this application as submitted.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, very much.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Number eleven, Donald Wilson on behalf of **DOMELUCA, LLC** requests a Wetland Permit for bluff vegetation restoration along the irregularly shaped sections of the bluff and property, specifically the 113'x68' (7,294sq.ft.) eastern area, a 65'x75' (6,372sq.ft.) area closest to the pool, and a 41'x190' (4,741sq.ft.) area closest to the water where existing privet (*Ligustrum vulgare*) is to be removed and re-vegetated using native plant species such as Northern Bayberry, Beach Plum, Groundsel Bush, Switchgrass, Little Bluestem Grass, Sweetfern, and Shadbush; and the existing intact Eastern Red



Cedars will be retained.

Located: 14909 Route 25, East Marion. SCTM# 1000-23-1-2.8

The Trustees did a field inspection on May 9th and noted it was important to save all the cedars and cherry, black cherry in the area.

The Conservation Advisory Council resolved to support this application.

The LWRP coordinator wrote an extensive review on this particular project, in fact the neighboring two projects to be inconsistent. The inconsistency arises from the fact that, and I'll just summarize this. I won't read the whole thing.

Recommends the Board clarify the total acreage where vegetation will be removed; if the work will be staged, during what season removal of vegetation would begin; significant impacts to Dam Pond wildlife, water quality and shellfishing can result due removal of vegetation resulting in increase of erosion and turbidity; it goes on to discuss doing it this season would also include the, would probably include watering issues, survivability issues; and says existing trees and shrubs should not be disturbed; to facilitate views of the water the limbing up of trees could be allowed; the introduction of indigenous vegetation is supported; discuss the removal of privet, several paragraphs on that; and in general, this is a very long LWRP.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Which, if I might add, we only received yesterday. Our work session was Monday night, so this was late in coming. The Board didn't have an opportunity to review or communicate with you. We only received the LWRP report, it was drafted yesterday and so it's new to us when we came here this evening

TRUSTEE DOMINO: We await your comments. But the point is that it might be advisable to table to give you adequate time to look at the LWRP report and address all the issues. Because they are substantial and important. So you might, I want to throw that out there for you.

MR. WALKER: Jim Walker from Inter-Science, here with Donald Wilson for the three properties. Would you like to see them on the easel or should I discuss the project?

Simply tabling it is fine, but the LWRP saying that we should save the native trees and whatnot is always fine. The area is privet. It's a pure stand of privet. It's a ring around the three properties. It's the most privet I have ever seen on one piece of property. And the project will be staged. There are four priority items. They are on the maps. The four priorities are part of the early part of the project. There they are.

This is priority one. This is priority two. This is priority three. This is priority four. We are staging the project so that erosion doesn't happen, is a logical thing. We are intending to open up the entire shoreline anyway.

In most places, the privet is ten or 20 or 30 feet wide. But it's continuous all the way around. And we have an application in front New York State DEC, they are going to make

us put a silt fence and silt sediment traps on the bottom of project and on the top of the project to prevent erosion. We are going to be told temporary irrigation will be allowed, and it would be required for the first year or two of the project, especially July and August so the plants don't burn. But we are calling out for all native plants to go back, including on this plan, oak trees. We are calling for the use of light maple, we like to use for street trees, they are used all along the streets of Long Island. The reason being they are quick to take hold and become established, so they provide cover. This is a project that saves all the wetlands, takes the privet away, restores the shoreline and will be a huge benefit to wildlife and native environment of the pond.

The pond is in great shape. The wetlands are in great shape. How the privet got there, I don't have the vaguest idea. But the plantings that we are calling out for will be a big asset to the wildlife in the area.

The project is pretty gentle, sediment traps, silt fencing. I'm sure the Board is familiar with. This is not a huge area. We have four priorities, if you are willing to issue an approval that is staged and each time Donald Wilson comes back and speaks to the contact person for that particular area on the Board of Town Trustees and to make sure that everything is done as carefully as possible.

It's a big project. It is ambitious, but it's also the right project for the pond and the three parcels. I believe this property was six properties originally, now it's three. They are going to take the old barn down that is blowing into the water, and two sheds, one masonry, one framed, and replace those areas with native shrubs and trees as well. Other than that --

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Two quick questions. That map is similar to what is in here?

MR. WALKER: That tells you what is on the different sections of the property. That was done early on in the project and then we refined the existing plans jointly between my office and Whitemore's landscape architect did the work, and then we at the end provided the planting plan to plant back. That is a lot of native plant material. I have five copies if -- do you want --

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: It's what we looked out in the field.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: This is what we looked at in the field. This is the same as what is on that.

MR. WILSON: We have more copies if anybody needs it.

MR. WALKER: Yes. The design there is intended to break it down by area. The planting plan is what is going to be planted back. The existing conditions plan, which I did jointly with the landscape architect, tells you what is there. And there are some black cherry trees there, and some of them are in miserable shape and should simply be removed.

Some of the black cherry trees, especially younger trees, would do very well and enhance the planting that is going to go in there. So. When the black cherry is dead, it's pretty

obvious. Dead and diseased.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: It's your belief the cedars reached the end of their life cycle?

MR. WALKER: The cedars up here, the landscape architect intended to preserve all those. And the cedar trees here that are very high with no limbs, and those probably need to go. But, we will be glad to speak with the Board of Trustees' representative and deal with any cedar trees on an individual basis when the work is underway. Some trees are worth saving, some trees are not.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Just to be clear, you are going to pass on my suggestion that we table this so you have an opportunity to look at the LWRP?

MR. WALKER: I didn't say that. I'll let Don --

MR. WILSON: We'll take the Board's advice on what is most pragmatic. We feel it's a sound plan and the client's intent is to bring everything back to natural vegetation. We thought we were doing basically what the Board approved of. We were surprised by the comments. But everything you commented to was not our design intent anyway. We planned to stage the work and are more than happy to take their recommendation on how to stage the work.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: At this point I only summarized it. You have not had the opportunity to look at each and every point.

MR. WILSON: True.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: So we are trying to avail you of that opportunity.

MR. WILSON: After watching the last experience we just saw on a couple applications before, I'm going to err on the side of caution. Let me ask, if we table this for just the one month, we can come back after having read it next month as opposed to starting the whole application again.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Certainly.

MR. WILSON: I'll take your advice.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Again, your approach is very comprehensive, as is our LWRP coordinator. So we have the benefit of seeing your work product, and it's very substantial. I have been at the site a number of times. And coordinating it with the LWRP report should not be difficult for your group based on the quality of the work being done, and it would be a matter of maybe detailing specific points of time staging, possibly the size of equipment and possibly using a skid steer, what kind of equipment is used.

There again, I can't even go into so much detail, I only saw this literally five minutes before we came in tonight.

MR. WALKER: I thought the farmers would talk about how to remove the trees. You wrap a chain around it, put it around the tractor, the tow bar, pull it up hill and hold on to the end of the chain --

TRUSTEE DOMINO: That's the way Nick does it.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: That's how you remove shrubs from a field you want to plant. Very similar.

MR. WALKER: I'm only trying to make you laugh. If you are intending to allow us to come back, you should tell us when a work session would be.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: That's what I was going to point out. The next meeting would be June 20th at 5:30, here.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Do you want them to come to a work session or just to have a chance to review the LWRP coordinator's review?

TRUSTEE DOMINO: As Jay pointed out, we need to have an opportunity review this ourselves. We just literally got this this evening.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: So you don't necessarily need them to come to the work session, just the next hearing.

MR. WILSON: We would be allowed to come before you for the next work session so you can see it to coordinate.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: That's the important point.

MR. WILSON: What we usually do is review and make a point-by-point replay. If we are provided with LWRP report, we will be back to you with whatever is needed.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: That would be helpful because if we did not feel that it adequately addresses the LWRP, we are constrained in what we can do.

MR. WALKER: We have done a lot of bluff projects. I'm confident we can do this.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: I want to point out, I looked at the LWRP, is exactly the same in all three properties. So if you choose to do it, table it for review, you should take all three.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: The Monday evening, June 18th work session, would be the likely work session we would go to reviewing it. But if you would like, it would probably be advisable to get in prior to the next field inspection so the Board would have an opportunity to take first look at it at the work session in the morning of the field inspection, if they felt they wanted to go back out. So it would be June 13th is the next field inspection. But certainly by June 18th, the evening work session.

MR. WALKER: That's fine.

MR. WILSON: Do we make a motion to repeal the application or --

TRUSTEE DOMINO: We can adjourn it at the applicant's request. So if you want, I'll make that motion.

MR. WILSON: We request you make a motion to table at our request.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: I'll make a motion to table at the applicant's request. All three.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

MR. HAGAN: For the sake of the record, we are tabling at the applicant's request, items eleven, 12 and 13.

MR. WALKER: We'll be in touch with the Trustees office to get a copy of the report.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Back on the record. The next application, number 14, En-Consultants on behalf of **TIMOTHY & GEORGIA QUINN**

request a Wetland Permit to renovate existing one-story, single-family dwelling with partial second floor as follows: Remove 51sq.ft. of existing second floor deck on east side of dwelling; construct new roof over existing 24'x35' partial second floor to remain; remove existing 165sq.ft. second floor deck on north side of dwelling and construct new 192sq.ft. second floor deck (over existing first floor deck to remain); construct 7'x15' second floor addition (with flat roof) and 21.5'x30' second floor addition over existing first story to remain; extend existing chimney above new roof; construct a 9'x32' pergola addition over existing pool deck to remain; construct new flat roofs on the landward south side of the dwelling over existing 45sq.ft. and 86sq.ft. covered porches and over 24sq.ft. and 91sq.ft. portions of existing first floor, all to remain; and install a drainage system of gutters to leaders to drywells to contain roof runoff, and in accordance with Chapter 236 of the Town Code-Stormwater Management. Located: 63165 North Road, Greenport. SCTM# 1000-40-1-14

The project has been deemed to be exempt under the LWRP.

The Conservation Advisory Council supports the application however there was no access to the property as the gate was locked. And the site does not depict adequate draining for the site and pool backwash.

The Board did not see that as deficient.

Is there anyone here who wishes to speak on behalf of this application?

MR. HERRMANN: Yes. Rob Herrmann of En-Consultants on behalf of the applicant.

This is a project that is located within 100 feet of the top of the bluff, so it requires a Chapter 275 permit, which is why we are here before you. And also setback relief from the Zoning Board of Appeals, which we have already obtained through appeal number 7151.

As you saw, it is an extensive project description and an extensive site plan but it all describes a lot of work that is in fact occurring all within the existing footprint of the existing structures, which have prior Trustee approvals and prior Zoning Board approval as well.

So unless the Board has any specific questions, I would keep my presentation pretty short to that extent that, again, we are, it's really all construction that is occurring within the existing structural footprint.

Oh, and on your one point there is, we do have drainage calculations and a drainage system of leaders, gutters and drywells proposed, and that was included on the site plan

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: I just opened the site plan up. It is included on the site plan. Thank you

MR. HERRMANN: I always try to include that.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: And detailed line drawings of the drains themselves. Any questions from the Board?

(Negative response).

Our field notes indicated it was substantially -- and was okay submitted based on the field inspection, with respect to our standards.

Hearing no comments, is there anyone else who wishes to speak to this application?

(NO RESPONSE).

Seeing no one, I make a motion to close the hearing in this matter.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: I make a motion to approve this application as submitted.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Number 15, En-Consultants on behalf of **DAVID KRUPNICK** requests a Wetland Permit to install a 3'x12' hinged ramp and a 6'x20' floating dock situated in a "T" position, parallel to the shoreline and secured by two (2) 8" diameter two-pile dolphins off seaward end of existing 4' x ±46" fixed timber catwalk (with 1.7'x11' bench) to remain; cut existing dilapidated ±17' bulkhead and ±23' groin to grade; and connect water and electricity to the dock.

Located: 880 Deep Hole Drive, Mattituck. SCTM# 1000-115-12-13

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: The LWRP found this to be inconsistent. The inconsistencies were according to town records the as-built dock structure was constructed without obtaining Board of Trustees review regulatory permit; proposed vessel to be moored at the dock has not been identified; proof that the proposed dock structure meets the one-third rule has not been provided; and the incremental and segmented extension of permanent private dock structures into public trust waters does not meet this policy.

The Conservation Advisory Council resolved to support this application.

The Trustees conducted a field inspection on May 9th and questioned the need to leave the outermost piling, noting that the dock seemed to be within the pier line. And also noting that there was pruning of wetland bushes. And also noting limited to one floating dock, no jet ski floats allowed. Also note there is a letter in the file from Rob Herrmann addressing some of the LWRP's concerns, specifically the proposed floating dock would remain within the pier line established by adjoining dock structures and would extend approximately 25 feet seaward, i.e. 22% of the 119 foot width of the waterway. Because the maximum one-third intrusion would equal 39 feet, a boat with a beam of ten feet could be comfortably docked on the outside of the float with a few feet to spare before reaching that limitation.

Is there anyone here who wishes to speak regarding this application?

MR. HERRMANN: Yes. Rob Herrmann of En-Consultants on behalf of the applicant. There is one thing, Glenn, I think that's 26 feet. Either you read it wrong or I have a typo.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I probably read it wrong. It's 26 feet.

MR. HERRMANN: So the Board knows there is some history with this site. This goes back to a violation of I think from 2017 when there was a bunch of plastic jet ski floats and things that were tied up to the end of the fixed catwalk. But those floats have been out of the water for about six months. So just the other thing I noted in that, that memo to the Board, is just that the LWRP comments about the existing dock structure not being permitted is just out of date, because I think those comments referred to the unpermitted floating docks that were since removed. And the fixed dock that you are standing on, that photo dates back to Wetlands permit 1708 that was originally issued to John Kosloski and transferred later to Osler and then subsequently transferred to Krupnick.

So we did meet at the site with the Board when we were originally contemplating this proposal, and basically the direction was if we could get a ramp and float installed in a "T" configuration and stayed within the pier line, stayed within the one-third rule, that it would be a reasonable application. Which is what we have done.

Originally there had been a requirement on a prior Board approval, and it may have been when the transfer was done, I can't remember now, but that dilapidated bulkhead and groin section, be either cut to grade or removed. So based on those conversations and directions from the Board, we included that. The one thing that did come up since then was, which was not in my original application, but Mr. Krupnick had asked and I can point to it, I think you know where it is, but there is a piling here at the end of this groin section. It looks like it's been lifted up a little bit during the winter. But he had asked if he could maintain that pile basically as a storm tie. When we originally discussed the application, we talked about putting in some sort of tie off piling and I said I was not really sure if the Board would be too keen on adding new pilings to that area. And he said well what about when we remove the groin, if we could just maintain that one pile because then the boat will be docked parallel, the bow would be facing left from the view of that photo, and then he would have something to tie the boat back to during the storm. And that pile is actually inboard of where the end of the dock would be, so it would actually be closer to the shoreline.

So that would be just something we would ask if we could include with our application, assuming there was no objection to it. But otherwise it's mostly what you expected. I did ask him about the pruning, he said yes, that I think once a year in the spring his wife will go out and sort of top some of the

Baccharus to keep it coming out fuller at the base, because that's how she treats everything, you know, all the other shrubs on the property. So there was no harm intended there. Obviously if the Board would like to see them discontinue that pruning, we can certainly pass that along. But as soon as I brought it up they knew exactly what you were referring to and said, yes, they had done that.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Is there anyone else here who wishes to speak regarding this application?

(Negative response).

Any questions or comment from the Board?

TRUSTEE DOMINO: On that piling, do we have assurances the piling will be used to tie off for storm purposes and not for additional floats?

MR. HERRMANN: Become like a second -- oh, yes, of course. I mean that, it would be, he would be in violation again if he adds another float there, so. Which I know is not always persuasive.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: No one ever does that.

MR. HERRMANN: Given the history here, all I can really represent on my end is we'll remind him of that, that there can't be any additional floats, jet ski floats, or anything else tied off in the water aside from the one 6x20 floating dock we are seeking.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: I just mention that because I didn't see a for sale sign on the plastic floats.

MR. HERRMANN: Well, I don't know if he is actually trying to create the 6x20 float out of one of or more of those floats. I don't know. But I have mentioned it to them. Again, it's, I'm not sure it could be much clearer at this point that he can only install what he has a permit for. But we both see it all every day, so.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Thank you, very much, for your comments.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: While we are piling on, the Baccharus pruning didn't look so terrible. It's when you prune the babies. If you are encouraging new Baccharus growth, culturally, that would be in the exempt category when we talk about judicious, so I don't think -- but we didn't notice any of the stuff on the bottom that was cut up.

MR. HERRMANN: As long as that description of what I was told matches what you saw, that sounds like that was generally what was happening.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Leave the babies.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Any other questions or comments from the Board?

(Negative response).

I make a motion to close this hearing.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I make a motion to approve this application noting that the non-permitted plastic jet ski floats have been removed, noting that proof has been submitted that the dock will not exceed the one-third rule, and that the outermost piling may



remain as a tie-off pile only, thereby bringing it into consistency with the LWRP. That's my motion.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Motion made and seconded. All in favor?  
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Number 16, En-Consultants on behalf of **GEORGE KATSAMANIS** requests a Wetland Permit to construct approximately 134 linear feet of vinyl retaining wall with +8' and +12' returns along top of embankment, and backfill where necessary with approximately 15 cubic yards of clean sand fill to be trucked in from an approved upland source; construct approximately 130 linear feet of low-sill vinyl bulkhead with +8' and +12' returns; dredge 10' wide, approximately 1,200sq.ft. area seaward of proposed low-sill bulkhead to a maximum depth of -24" Mean Low Low Water, and create approximately 1,400sq.ft. of intertidal marsh by backfilling area landward of proposed low-sill bulkhead with approximately 45 cubic yards of dredged spoil to be planted with *Spartina alterniflora* (12" O.C.); restore disturbed portions of existing naturally vegetated slope located between proposed retaining wall and tidal wetlands boundary with native vegetation; and establish and perpetually maintain a 10' wide, approximately 1,350 square foot non-turf buffer area landward of the proposed retaining wall. Located: 1025 Gull Pond Lane, Greenport. SCTM# 1000-35-4-28.40

The LWRP coordinator found this application to be consistent, although it did note all intertidal construction and excavation requires a silt boom.

The Conservation Advisory Council resolved to support this application.

The Trustees last visited this site on the 9th -- I believe inhouse, actually. Yes, it was an inhouse field visit there, and noted that this was a straightforward application.

Is there anyone hear that wishes to speak to this application?

MR. HERRMANN: Yes. Rob Herrmann of En-Consultants on behalf of the applicant. Mostly I just want to thank the Board for the amount of time that you have spent with me on this property and talking about this project.

As you all know, it was before you, um, I think at least a year ago, and we have put a lot of time and thought and effort into coming up with a proposal here that would benefit the applicant in terms of erosion control.

He is in a tough spot. He's on a canal that is nearly 100% bulkheaded, including on both sides, and this is a shoreline that is naturally eroding, and we understand the Board typically is trying to keep what is left. And I think the proposal we have put in front of you is a good one. I think the low sill bulkhead down along the shoreline, first of all, it's going to create the intertidal marsh area that is being proposed. It will allow to recover some of the depth immediately on the seaward

side of that as that material will be dredged and then redeposited behind the low sill bulkhead as the substrate for the marsh. And then the retaining wall, rather than having a wet toe, will be upright at the top of the embankment, and I think overall you'll end up with a situation where you have a low sill bulkhead on the bottom, it will be flat, it will run back with the marsh and then you'll basically have sort of a reconstructed natural embankment there leading up to the retaining wall. And in theory, that retaining wall would only become exposed if that entire natural shoreline eroded away, which obviously we hope won't happen. But if it did, it basically serves as an insurance policy.

So again, we appreciate the time that you spent with us on it. Hopefully you found the proposal to be consistent with our discussion and what you expected.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Just to address the LWRP note there about the silt boom. Do you have a silt boom on the project?

MR. HERRMANN: I don't know if we put that in the notes, but that would be typical for the dredging if nothing else, so conditioned upon use of a silt boom. We think we know what contractor is going to be working there, and he typically has a silt boom for these kinds of projects now, so that should not be a problem.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Okay.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: I want to take a little time to thank you. Most typically your applications include ten or 15-foot wide non-turf buffer. You obviously understand the intent of the buffer is to mitigate applications of pesticides or whatever on the property that we all love our waters here and we want to keep them that way. And I'm thanking you for that. Keep it going forward.

MR. HERRMANN: Not a problem. Thanks, Mike

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Any other comments?

(Negative response).

Anyone else that wishes to speak?

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: It's a well-designed project. You did really well with this one.

MR. HERRMANN: Thank you.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Hearing nothing else, I make a motion to close are hearing.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: And I make a motion to approve this application with the stipulation that a silt boom is used during construction.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

MR. HERRMANN: Thank you.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Motion to adjourn.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: So moved.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All in favor?  
(ALL AYES).

Respectfully submitted by,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, reading "Michael J. Domino". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized "M" and "D".

Michael J. Domino, President  
Board of Trustees